

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **March 22, 2004** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-54. Claims 1-36 were rejected under U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter. Claims 37-54 were allowed. Claims 1 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 2-18 and 20-36 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Independent claims 1 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because it is not clear from the language of the claim where the authentication takes place.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 19 to state that the said communication received from the server is authenticated at the KDC. This amendment finds support on page 4, lines 15-21 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-18, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 20-36, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

Claims 37-54 have been allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: April 9, 2004

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 Second Street, Suite 201  
Davis, CA 95616-4692  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665